

**REMARKS**

This response is a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action dated September 7, 2006. In the present Office Action, claims 1-18 are pending in the application, claims 1-18 stand rejected, and no claims have been allowed. Acknowledgement of the foreign priority claim has been made with an acknowledgement of receipt of all foreign priority documents.

By this response, claims 1 and 11 have been amended to make editorial changes thereto and to include the limitations of claims 6 and 17, respectively. The added limitations are supported by the original claims and by the original specification at page 3, lines 23-24 and at page 9, lines 2-3. Claims 2 and 12 have been amended to correct antecedent basis for a term therein. The amendments are believed to be proper and justified. No new matter has been added.

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following remarks, it is submitted that the claims pending in the application are novel nonobvious. It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. By this response, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

***CITED ART***

U.S. Patent 5,903,833 to Jonsson et al. ("Jonsson"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0140145 A1 to Lindberg et al. ("Lindberg"), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0137498 to Goss ("Goss") are all cited and applied in the present Office Action.

***CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102******CLAIMS 1-4, 7-9, 11-14, AND 18***

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-14, and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Jonsson. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. In view of the amendments to these claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, in part, calls for a method:

*wherein the received contacts are directed to the at least one other communication system based, at least in part, on a parameter selected from a group of parameters including at least one of: a presence of text content in said contact, a presence of audio content in said contact, a presence of pictorial content in said contact, a subject of said contact, a caller originating said contact, and a calling group originating said contact.*

Jonsson appears to permit *the user to determine a target* for call forwarding. Jonsson fails to teach, show, or suggest a method in which redirection or call forwarding is determined by using a *parameter included in the contact or message*.

For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 to be proper, the cited art must show each and every element as set forth in a claim. (See, MPEP § 2131.01.) Since the cited art does not describe each and every element in claim 1, it is believed that Jonsson does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-4, and 7-9 depend directly from claim 1 and include all the limitations in claim 1. In view of the remarks above with respect to claim 1, it is believed that Jonsson does not anticipate dependent claims 2-4 and 7-9. It is submitted, therefore, that claims 1-4 and 7-9 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 11 includes a limitation similar to the one described above for claim 1. For the reasons cited above with respect to claim 1, it is submitted that the cited art does not describe each and every element in claim 11. Hence, it is believed that Jonsson does not anticipate claim 11. Claims 12-14 and 18 depend directly from claim 11 and include all the limitations in claim 11. In view of the remarks above with respect to claims 1 and 11, it is believed that Jonsson does not anticipate dependent claims 12-14 and 18. It is submitted, therefore, that claims 11-14 and 18 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### **CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103**

##### **CLAIMS 5 AND 15**

Claims 5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Lindberg. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or

in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (See, MPEP § 2142.). Motivations to combine or modify references must come from the references themselves or be within the body of knowledge in the art. (See, MPEP § 2143.01.)

Jonsson was described above. It was conceded in the present Office Action on page 6 that Jonsson lacked any teaching about operating in an IP multimedia system environment as defined in claims 5 and 15. Lindberg was added to Jonsson to bridge the gap in Jonsson's teachings. Even if Lindberg supplied this missing teaching to Jonsson, and Assignee's representative does not acquiesce to this proposition, the combined references would still lack any teaching with respect to the limitation in claims 1 and 11 that:

*the received contacts are directed to the at least one other communication system based, at least in part, on a parameter selected from a group of parameters including at least one of: a presence of text content in said contact, a presence of audio content in said contact, a presence of pictorial content in said contact, a subject of said contact, a caller originating said contact, and a calling group originating said contact.*

Since claims 5 and 15 depend directly from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and in view of the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 5 and 15 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 5 and 15 be withdrawn.

#### **CLAIMS REJECTIONS 35 USC § 103**

##### **CLAIMS 10 AND 16**

Claims 10 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Goss. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Jonsson was described above. It was conceded in the present Office Action on page 7 that Jonsson lacked any teaching about automatic deactivation of redirection as defined in claims 10 and 16. Goss was added to Jonsson to bridge the gap in Jonsson's teachings. Even if Goss supplied this missing teaching to Jonsson, and Assignee's

representative does not acquiesce to this proposition, the combined references would still lack any teaching with respect to the limitation in claims 1 and 11 that:

*the received contacts are directed to the at least one other communication system based, at least in part, on a parameter selected from a group of parameters including at least one of: a presence of text content in said contact, a presence of audio content in said contact, a presence of pictorial content in said contact, a subject of said contact, a caller originating said contact, and a calling group originating said contact.*

Contrary to the Examiner's asserted position at page 7 of the Office Action, there is no suggestion in Jonsson to deactivate redirection automatically. Such an asserted position is inconsistent with the admission that Jonsson "doesn't expressly disclose wherein the deactivation of redirection is automatic when the terminal is switched on or at the latest after a certain time." See *Office Action at page 7, section 7.*

Since claims 10 and 16 depend directly from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and in view of the reasons set forth above for all these claims, it is submitted that claims 10 and 16 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 10 and 16 be withdrawn.

#### ***CITATION OF ADDITIONAL REFERENCES***

The Examiner has cited, but not applied, U.S. Patent 6,590,969 issued to Peters et al., U.S. Patent 5,970,388 issued to Will, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0102188 to Boyer et al., and U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0115471 to DeLoye et al. These references have been reviewed and are believed to be merely cumulative over the references already applied to the claims. Since these references were not applied against the claims, it is assumed that the Examiner concurs in this viewpoint.

In light of this review, it is believed that the claims are allowable over these references, separately or in combination.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Gregory C. Ranieri, Esq. at (503) 439-6500 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account number 50-3703.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: **February 7, 2007**

**/Gregory C. Ranieri, Reg. No. 29,695/**

Gregory C. Ranieri, Attorney of Record

Registration No. 29,695

BERKELEY LAW & TECHNOLOGY GROUP, LLP  
1700 NW 167<sup>th</sup> Place, Suite 240  
Beaverton, OR 97006  
Phone: 503.439.6500  
Customer Number: 43831